

# MEETING SUMMARY

**MEETING:** South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team

**DATE:** April 25, 2002

**TIME:** 5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

**LOCATION:** Vee Quiva Casino

## ATTENDANCE:

Carlie Billen Back, South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce  
Lee Banning, Maricopa County Farm Bureau  
Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA  
Chad Campbell, Sierra Club  
Chuck Crist, Lakewood HOA  
Chuck Cunningham, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce  
Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee  
Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council

Sharolyn Hohman, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Angela Mazzi, Valley Forward  
Robert Moss, United Arizona Dairymen  
Wayne Nelson, GRIC District 7  
Laura Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development  
James Slaker, Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee

## STAFF:

Thor Anderson, ADOT  
Debra Duerr, HDR  
Amy Edwards, HDR  
John Roberts, GRIC DOT

Bill Vachon, FHWA  
Mary Viparina, ADOT  
John Godec, GRA  
Theresa Gunn, GCI

**MEETING SUMMARY:** Jennifer Graziano, GCI

---

**NEXT MEETING:** Thursday, May 23, 2002

## ACTION PLAN:

Task/Activity	Who	By When
Send CAT information on public meetings	GCI	
Evaluate the water resources information	HDR	
Add link to Maricopa County air monitoring stations	GCI	
What does South Mountain do to noise – absorb or bounce back?	HDR	
Add original DCR to website	GCI	
Create a base map for May meeting	HDR	
Need a better understanding of who is using the new freeway	HDR	
Schedule another meeting on traffic	GCI	
Explain 4F versus 6F	HDR	

**HANDOUTS:**

- Example Corridor Screening Assessment Matrix
- Draft Screening Criteria Matrix; Typical Alignment Evaluation and Analysis Criteria

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

John Godec, GRA, opened the meeting by welcoming the members, and asking if they had any new issues or concerns to report.

***Follow-up From Last Meeting:***

- Original alignment DCR shows that the freeway would be depressed through Laveen.
- **Comment:** Residents have been told that the current water table is too high to allow a freeway to be depressed.

***CAP Member Questions and Comments:***

- **Question:** The meeting on the freeway on April 30<sup>th</sup> – whose is it? **Answer:** The project team is hosting the meeting at the request of Davidt Folts' group.
- **Question:** What information can we say and what can we not say? **Response:** Any confidential information will be clearly marked and its use discussed with the members.

**PROJECT STATUS**

Amy Edwards, HDR Engineering, gave an update on the planning/technical status of the project.

- Completing baseline study.
- Preliminary traffic sensitivity modeling is underway.
- Project schedule - have had a couple of delays.
  - MAG Model computer crash – six weeks delay, now behind schedule.
  - GRIC has indicated they have alternatives – need four to six weeks to go through their process.
- Completed alternative screening criteria and process.
- Closest air monitoring station is in west Chandler; will bring air quality professionals in later in the process.

***CAP Member Questions and Comments:***

- **Comment:** Water analysis – people in area with basements have sump pumps. Because of drought the water table is lower than normal. **Response:** Amy will evaluate the water resources information.
- **Question:** Does the baseline environment work include diesel emissions along Pecos? **Answer:** Air quality is reviewed and studied later in the process.
- **Comment:** Have had discussions in Ahwatukee about current air quality.

- **Question:** How do you mitigate noise from freeway and effect of mountain on noise?

## **REVIEW ALTERNATIVE SCREENING PROCESS**

Amy Edwards, HDR Engineering, gave a presentation on the alternative screening process.

- Discussed the formation of corridors to determine which corridors meet purpose and need and then evaluate which corridors meet major environmental criteria based on regulations.
- Can we fit alternatives in corridors without major impacts?
- Split alignment will be analyzed by looking at the original alignment and connection at the Loop 101.
- US60 extension – alternatives to Pecos Road tie to I-17 or further west to Loop 101.

### ***CAP Member Questions and Comments:***

- **Question:** Will all corridors also be impacted by GRIC alternatives?
- **Question:** Does each alignment have a width? **Answer:** Federal and ADOT guidelines will determine corridor/alignment widths.
- **Question:** There is not enough information on the base map. Is it possible to see more features i.e. casinos, power corridors? **Answer:** Aerial photography is now available.
- **Comment:** I-10/Pecos Road Landowners are concerned about communication with the property owners on the development of GRIC alignment alternatives.
- **Comment:** Agree that it makes sense to break into corridors.
- **Question:** What was the thought behind the corridors widths? **Answer:** Need to work with traffic engineers. There is nothing magical about the corridors. They were based on hypothetical alignments.
- **Question:** Have you decided it has to be a freeway and not a parkway or other? **Answer:** Not yet, need to do the analysis.
- **Comment:** Who are these people and where are they going? Need to look at the whole regional traffic picture.
- **Comment:** Freeway will be bumper to bumper as soon as it is built.
- **Comment:** Will create more growth. 60% of current building permits are in the Southwest Valley.
- **Question:** What happens if we don't build it?
- **Question:** We are only looking at freeway alternatives. Don't we need to look at others? **Answer:** It's only part of the solution. Need to look at the whole package of other modes.
- **Comment:** No regional planning process – need more holistic approach. Habits don't change overnight. **Reponse:** We do look at modal analysis.
- **Comment:** Need information. How will this road help the Broadway Curve congestion? How will we get the money- federal anything above a local road percentage of federal funds stay the same.

- **Comment:** We need a road – a blvd or parkway won't work. We need it. When can we have it done?

## **REVIEW PUBLIC ALIGNMENTS**

John reconvened the group and asked the question does the group agree there is a traffic problem and something needs to be done? The group agreed there is a purpose and need and the study should go forward and the process is valid.

- Need more information on the land use impacts.
- Group discussed the desire to move forward.

## **CoNEXUS DEMONSTRATION**

The group participated in a demonstration of the CoNexus software and keypad system which can be utilized by the group to frame the issues and identify where they agree and/or disagree.

## **PLUS/DELTA MEETING EVALUATION**

- + Presentations of criteria.
- + Hot food.
- + Illustration of important and performance factors. Explanation of transportation corridors study process.
- + Good input from others.
- + Food and location.
- + Dinner out of room cookies in room. Handouts helpful.
- + Discussion during Amy's presentation was good. Voting method or opinion gathering tool was good/interesting.
- + People talked more than consultants.
- + Learning aides.
- + Technology, dinner.
- + Good software.
- + Group interaction.
- + Liked voting system – it helped avoid circular discussions. Enjoyed Amy's approach/attitude – look forward to working with her more.
- + Interesting discussion; survey of criteria and results.
- Δ Room seems to be getting smaller.
- Δ Would like to stay more to specific freeway alignments instead of getting so far off bounds.

- Δ Lack of control. Still not sure where night was headed.
- Δ More traffic discussions. Explain criteria. Speed up meeting.
- Δ Need better maps, concepts need to be better defined.
- Δ Better information on some of tax details on the criteria.
- Δ Criteria for selection very confusing.
- Δ Need to convince or get better handle on how many people, business, service, etc. commute from east to west Valley; would lessen opposition if it is proven that there is large volume.
- Δ Staying focused on task at hand.
- Δ More input from Tribal officials and other districts from Gila River Indian Community.
- Δ Limited information – data on air quality, link between transportation and growth.
- Δ Need a better understanding of origin and destination of trips. Some are still confused.
- Δ Expand criteria for corridors. Show criteria/corridors for total South Mountain Loop.
- Δ Still seem to be having same discussions. We need to move forward and talk about specific design ideas.
- Δ Less parochialism.

### **SUGGESTED MEETING TOPICS:**

- Review traffic projections.
- Good estimate of changes in average travel time 2000-2025.
- Real, actual air quality numbers for the area from I-10 to 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue South of South Mountain.
- Noise impact. Noise abatement when surrounding area is higher than the freeway.
- Reality or validity of the three percent traffic number from east to west.
- Discuss roadway design options and develop preferences including integration of multi-modal options.
- Does the income of a community or village have more power than a lesser village or community.
- What part of cost play in alignments in and out of Tribal/allotted lands? On reservation – less cost, off – more cost.
- To see traffic modeling numbers on the other proposed alignments.
- More information on existing and potential users of freeway. Not focus on through travel. Effect on surface streets if no freeway.
- Compare travel time to work now versus what it will be in 10 years, 20 years and so on.
- More information to the need of the freeway or current traffic counts to the number of cars traveling Riggs Road and forecast to the number in the future.